

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In Re Application of:

Pauli SEPPINEN : Confirmation No. **3300**

Serial No: **10/606,284** : Examiner: **Eugene YUN**

Filed: **June 25, 2003** : Group Art Unit: **2618**

For: **BLUETOOTH RF BASED RF-TAG READ/WRITE STATION**

Mail Stop Appeal Briefs-Patents
Commission for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

Sir:

This Reply Brief is in furtherance of the Appeal Brief filed July 15, 2010, and in response to the Examiner's Answer of October 25, 2010.

REMARKS

In response to the Examiner's Answer of October 25, 2010, appellant reiterates the arguments presented in the Appeal Brief filed July 15, 2010, and responds to the Examiner's Answer as follows.

Appellant has previously argued in the Appeal Brief that the limitation of claim 1 regarding the mixer being useable for a transceiver operating as a radio frequency tag reader or as a Bluetooth transceiver, was not shown by the cited references because the mixer (27) of *Gunnarsson* was not used by the Bluetooth module (24). In response, the Office asserts on page 14 of the Examiner's Answer that Figure 2 of *Gunnarsson* shows that a signal from the Bluetooth module (24) can be input into the mixer (27) of the RFID module via signal path (29), and therefore that there is no proof in *Gunnarsson* that the mixer (27) is not used by the Bluetooth module (24). Appellant respectfully disagrees. *Gunnarsson* specifically states that the only hardware added for the RFID function is the mixer (9), i.e. the unit (27) in Figure 2. *See Gunnarsson* page 5, lines 28-30. The mixer (9) is from the RFID system of Figure 1, and therefore there is no indication that the mixer (9) from an RFID only system of Figure 1 would have Bluetooth functionality. Instead, Figure 2 only shows a RFID system integrated into a telephone that includes a Bluetooth channel, and the signals from the Bluetooth module (24) are not input into the mixer (27) since the junction point (29) is for information carrying signals from identification devices. *See Gunnarsson* page 5, lines 22-26.

In addition, the Office further asserts on page 15 of the Examiner's Answer that *Gunnarsson* states that the RFID module with mixer (27) is integrated with the circuits of the Bluetooth radio, and that this statement proves that the mixer (27) is used by both the Bluetooth module and the RFID module. However, in the passage referred to by the Office, it is merely stated that the mixer (27) is included in the standard circuits of the Bluetooth radio (24) as an integrated unit, and the portable communications unit is adapted to read identification devices that deliver a backscatter signal according to the Bluetooth standard. *See Gunnarsson* page 6, lines 4-7. Contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, this passage does not mention that the RFID module is integrated into the Bluetooth circuits. Instead, in the embodiment in which the

mixer (27) is included in the Bluetooth radio (24), the RFID module (26) is not included in the portable communications unit. Therefore, the mixer (27) is not usable for a transceiver operating as a radio frequency tag reader or as a Bluetooth transceiver, but is only usable for one of those two modes.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the present application are not disclosed or suggested by the references cited by the Office.

Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, appellant respectfully submits that the rejections of the final Office Action have been shown to be inapplicable, and respectfully requests that the Board reverse the rejections of pending claims 1-22. If any additional fee is required for submission of this Appeal Brief, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442.

Respectfully submitted,

/Francis J. Maguire/

Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Appellant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/lk
Customer No.: 10945